

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Select Education.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me this time.

Regrettably, today, I come to the floor to voice my opposition to H.R. 1. At the beginning of his presidency, President Bush outlined a bold vision for education that would move power and authority back to parents and back to States; a vision that included flexibility in how States and local schools would spend their money; a vision that would empower parents to make more educational decisions for their kids; and a change in process in how we would measure the results that Federal investments resulted in; a change in process where today we measure how we spend our dollars to a reform that said we are going to measure whether our children are learning or not.

The flexibility for States has been eliminated. The parental empowerment has been weakened. The results accountability has been added to the bill, but the red tape, where local school districts and States have to report back to Washington on how they spend their money, has been maintained. We are now going to tell States and local school districts how to spend their money as well as the results they are going to get. What we are left with is Goals 2001, after we fought Goals 2000; and accountability putting us on the road to national testing and spending that only President Clinton could have dreamed of.

It is time to rework parts of H.R. 1. I agree with Sandy Kress, the President's education adviser, in his comments yesterday. H.R. 1 is likely "going to require further weeks of thought and deliberation to fix." It is time to move back to the President's vision of education, not the bill that is working its way through the House today. It is time to send this bill back to committee and let the further weeks of thought and deliberation happen in committee and not in a conference committee.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

□ 1115

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, let me add my compliments to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member, and the staffs on both sides who have worked so hard on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, as it stands now, H.R. 1 is good enough. It is not great, mainly for what it leaves out. It would be a better bill if it included my amendment to keep coordinated services as

part of the act. That way, children and their families would have a safe place, at or near their school site, in order to have access to services, the services that they need when their lives are so very, very busy.

It is also too bad that my "Go Girl" amendment to bring more females into the math, science, engineering, and technology workforce was not included. When women, who are one-half of our population make up only 19 percent of our science, engineering, and technology workforce, we must encourage more girls to study these subjects. "Go Girl" would have done that.

On the other hand, H.R. 1 includes testing provisions, provisions that must be removed from this bill.

Two good things about H.R. 1 are what have been excluded in the bill; that are not in the bill. These good things are no private school vouchers and no block grants. Block grants would take education funds from students and schools which need them the most. But if these amendments pass, adding vouchers or block grants, then I would suggest that we defeat H.R. 1.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues, keep H.R. 1 clean so we can pass it. Otherwise, H.R. 1 is good enough to vote for. It would be better, however, with coordinated services, "Go Girl" programs, school construction, and smaller class size.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA).

(Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation. It is truly an example of bipartisanship, and it is an example of the way that the system is supposed to work.

This process has not been about politics, it has been about children and their educational standards. Yes, I have heard what others have said, and I am pleased to assert that without question this bill is reflective of President Bush's vision for education reform; and the President has indicated his support. So let there be no mistake about that for the people on my side of the aisle.

I also want to point out some of the good parts of this bill. It gives flexibility and local control and maintains it; and that was very important to me and very important on a bipartisan basis. I think the flexibility allows school districts in this bill the ability to target Federal resources where they are needed the most, and that will ensure that State and local officials can meet the unique needs of their students.

It also enhances accountability and demands results through high standards and assessments. Grades three through eight will have student testing. This is a provision that has not been clearly understood; and as a mem-

ber of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I want to explain this to everyone here.

It is important to emphasize that the States will develop their own standards and assessment. This bill does not dictate a national test. However, what the bill does say, if you are going to accept Federal education funding, then you are going to be held accountable for the results. State test results will be confirmed through the National Assessment of Educational Progress or a similar test. If a State improves on the NAEP, and their State assessments each year show a forward movement, they will be eligible for rewards. Those who do not improve will undergo corrective action.

Striking a balance between State and Federal responsibility is the right approach, and it is the way that we have done it and what the President has approved. I think that is awfully important.

I took leadership in terms of the question of safe schools, and I do not know how much of this has been emphasized in this debate, but namely we put into it mental health screening and services that are available to young people through the schools. Whether we are talking about violence in the schools or aggressiveness in schools, we want to deal with those tragedies and those growing symptoms of problems within the school system, and so we have school-based mental health services. And I was proud of being part of putting that in the bill.

Finally, is this a good bill? Yes. Does it reflect the President's priorities? Absolutely.

Mr. Chairman, those areas where there are continuing disagreements will be taken up in the debate on the amendments. So this is a full process. We can discuss the voucher question yet again. It is one on which I disagree. Vouchers should be out of this legislation, but it will be voted on as an amendment. In the end, we will be passing an historic education bill for our children and for the future of our country.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill. First and foremost, I would like to commend the Education and Workforce Committee Chairman BOEHNER and Ranking Member GEORGE MILLER for their leadership, hard work, and diligence.

This bill is truly an example of bipartisan ship. But make no mistake—this was not an easy process. There were many hurdles along the way—and many times we all thought an impasse had been reached. No one on either side ever lost sight of the goal—to ensure that every child, regardless of situation, in every public school in America received a quality education.

This is the way the process is supposed to work—partisan politics have been set aside to make way for a meaningful debate on the issues that matter to America and our children. This process has not been about politics—this process has been about children.

BUSH PLAN

Yes, I am pleased that the bill before us today is bipartisan. But I am also pleased that